

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Non-Final Office Action of May 7, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanesaka et al. (JP Pat. Pub. No. 06-265919); rejected claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Iizumi (U.S. Patent No. 4,850,228); rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Takeishi (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0005240); and allowed claims 1-6, 8-11, 15-20, and 23-30.

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 1-6 and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 8-11, 15-20, and 23-30. However, the rejections of the claims are traversed and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Specifically, the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanesaka et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 7 is patentable over Kanesaka et al. in that claim 7 recites a combination of elements including, for example “wherein the LCD includes a printed circuit board (PCB) at a rear of a display module, [the shield cover] comprising... a covering structure over the PCB, the covering structure comprising at least one elastically deformable region.” Kanesaka et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least these features of the claimed invention.

The rejection of claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Iizumi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 12 is patentable over Iizumi in that claim 12 recites a combination of elements including, for example “[a] shield cover for a liquid crystal display device having at least one device component... comprising... at least one elastically deformable region, wherein the at least one device component is selectively exposable by the at least one elastically deformable region.” Iizumi fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13 and 14, which depend from claim 12, are also patentable over Iizumi.

Further, in rejecting claim 12, the Examiner cites Iizumi as disclosing “a pressure meter including a casing, a semiconductor pressure sensor... a passage for introducing fluid under pressure to the pressure sensor, a display... [wherein] the display... is LCD and the knobs are

elastic/deformable.” Regardless of the alleged teachings of Iizumi, Applicants respectfully submit Iizumi fails to teach what is actually being claimed. To reiterate, claim 12 requires a shield cover having at least one elastically deformable region, wherein at least one device component of a LCD device is selectively exposable by the at least one elastically deformable region. Iizumi, teaching knobs which are elastic/deformable, therefore, does not anticipate claim 12.

The rejection of claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Takeishi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 21 is patentable over Takeishi in that claim 21 recites a combination of elements including, for example “a display module; a printed circuit board (PCB) fitted to the display module; at least one device component on the PCB; and a shield cover on the PCB, the shield cover including at least one elastically deformable region spaced over the at least one device component.” Takeishi fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22, which depends from claim 21, is also patentable over Takeishi.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.


Application No.: 10/025,910
Amendment dated August 2, 2004
Reply to non-final Office Action dated May 7, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.539.00-US

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: August 2, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Kurt M. Eaton

Registration No.: 51,640
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant